

Monday, December 17th 1990

Today's Topics:

Statistics
Re: Omni Magazine - Special UFO issue
Media coverage
Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit
Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 6
Phenomenon framed again!
Re: Al seckel
Re: Prof. Jean-Pierre Petit
Re: Phenomenon Framed Again!
Phenomenon framed again!
Re: Phenomenon framed again!
Phenomenon framed again!
Re: Phenomenon framed again!
Re: Phenomenon framed again!
Roswell Witness Surfaces

From: Kurt.Lochner@p22.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Kurt Lochner)
Subject: Statistics
Date: 11 Dec 90 17:44:56 GMT

Well, I'll be....my message did get out.

>
> Lazar's Element 115
> 2 0.3%

Terrific,

and I re-worked all the batch files for some other feeds too. Here's what I've been reading of late.

"Out There"-remarkable yet kinda hurried, which matters little to me. I find that book to be pretty credible, though non-committal. Yes, it answers the question that's been in everybody's mind for some time, unanswered by any kind of authority (plural). So, great...there IS some kind of coverup, but what's being covered up?

As I've said earlier, the Air Force and any others engaged in the subject have not generated a single reason or explanation to satisfy themselves to declassify anything of importance. Perhaps the outer "arms" of this galaxy, the Orion Arm being our district, are a little more crowded than even Drake's Equation permits?

"Above Top Secret" hehehe, I can't keep from skipping ahead to see some of the more recent sightings. Again, we have the texts of MJ-12 and several plates of some

pleasant faces, and some of the international sightings are really well done. It's not easy reading but it's interesting to find parts about the nuts/bolts.

And that's what I really wrote to you about..

I've been making noises about the propulsion scenarios involved with these sighting. Letting the sightings display the overall characteristics of such a machine saves alot of guesswork. The international sightings pointed it out, at least to me, when one guy said that it sounded kinda like a refrigerator taking off.

Later in the book, a guy that was present at some questionable crash recovery sight later on told his daughter that the craft operate on water, and that it might threaten the oil industry. To support this conjecture, I believe that if I was pressed to do, I could find a significant number of sightings around water, and I recall some from earlier publications of observing hoses in the water. If you think that boiling water under pressure does marvelous energy transfers, try thinking about water in a partial vacuum...or ammonia, or even methane.

So, in closing, I can see that my previous posting was pretty useless, I'll try not to waste bandwidth again until I've caught up my reading, but I thought that I might be able to add some useful conjecture as to what kind of "cover-up" might be occurring.

Thanks for the stats,
that was real big help.

--

Kurt Lochner - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Kurt.Lochner@p22.f66.n147.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Paul.Faeder@p0.f0.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Paul Faeder)
Subject: Re: Omni Magazine - Special UFO issue
Date: 13 Dec 90 05:26:00 GMT

To: conncoll.bitnet!gateh@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM
To: gateh@conncoll.bitnet

>'the nets') in general and this case in particular. I have attempted to
>send a copy to Paul, but it bounced as it was too large. If appropriate,
>perhaps it should be posted in several parts for upload so as to be easy
>on the nets (moderator?).

Thanks for the offer Gregg (and thanks also to Scott Savage).

I would be interested in reading about 'the nets' as you put it. I assume you mean e-mail networks such as FidoNet; perhaps ParaNet?

This discussion may be stretching the bounds of this conference. If you feel likewise, then you can e-mail this article to:

Paul.Faeder@p0.F102.n268.Z1.Fidonet.org (I think this will work);

...otherwise perhaps you can post the more important aspects of the article. I'm interested in their concern regarding the networks.

--

Paul Faeder - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Paul.Faeder@p0.f0.n1010.z9.FIDONET.ORG

This article has been forwarded to the Fido side for distribution over there.
(Cyro Lord - Moderator at hostsite.) And I have a copy here.

From: vm1.yorku.ca!YSCS1296@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM
Subject: Media coverage
Date: 14 Dec 90 04:54:26 GMT

From: user <YSCS1296@vm1.yorku.ca>

There seems to have been various bits of info floating around in the media of particular interest to those interested in the MJ-12 scenario.

To keep things brief:

The book BEST EVIDENCE details support for theory that JFK was assassinated from an order given by a high authority (supports Cooper's JFK stuff?)
INSIDE EDITION recently detailed an 'above top secret' memo that told of China's secret supply of weapons (nuke warheads, etc) to the Iraq. This is particular interesting given the file CARP.TXT and implications, and that this file was toted around the nets prior to the Gulf situation.
And finally, there are really actually lots of bits of information here and there in the papers, magazines and TV if one just keeps an eye out for them.
- Just my 2 bits worth -

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit
Date: 12 Dec 90 16:32:00 GMT

> The physicist Auguste Meesen, Professor at
> the University of Louvain, has proposed an explanation for
> this failure. In certain conditions, infrared rays coming
> from an object have the ability to totally inhibit the
> chemical reaction that permits fixing an image on a
> negative.
>
> Q: Is this a theory?
>
> A: Not at all. It is a fact demonstrated by experiment
> that has been known for a long time, but nobody up to now
> has thought of it in connection with UFO photos.

These guys know not whereof they speak. But I think I know what they're getting at.

We've all seen photos of what appear to be black ufos which the witnesses say they saw as being shiny silver etc. Presumably the same things fly at night too.

A photographic emulsion increases in density according to the amount of exposure to light. At a point, density cannot increase and, if exposure continues, emulsion response actually reverses.

Ansel Adams demonstrated this many years ago in a photo he calls, I think, Black Sun. It depicts a black sun over a normal-appearing landscape.

What happened is the the image of the sun reversed and lost density down to clear film base while the rest of the landscape was normal.

Anyway, we know this happens with visible light. Most panchromatic film is also very sensitive to IR, while color film tends to be sensitive to UV, in addition to visible light.

Presumably the same effect would occur if an object were radiating strong IR or UV. So, a shiny object (visually) radiating strong IR could conceivably cause reversal of a photographic image of itself.

These 'black ufos' are pretty commonly photographed on panchromatic black-and-white film. Has anyone seen a color photo of the same effect?

Film responds to light by photons knocking loose atoms of silver halide. In development, the silver halide which has lost atoms is converted to metallic silver while the unexposed halide is not.

When the film is fixed, the remaining halide is washed away and the metallic silver remains to form the image.

Color film works the same way, except that color dyes are coupled to the silver image and then the silver is bleached away, leaving only the dyes.

To put it simply, photochemistry doesn't work quite the way Meesen states, but he does have a very valid point about IR radiation.

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Interview with Jean-Pierre Petit Part 6
Date: 12 Dec 90 16:39:01 GMT

Very interesting interview.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Steve Rose)
Subject: Phenomenon framed again!
Date: 13 Dec 90 06:38:44 GMT

Did we all get to take a break from reality Wednesday night, and capture the outrageous segment of NBC's "Unsolved Mysteries" on our VCRs? This time-filling gem would have us wonder about the origin of some *mysterious lights* captured on a woman's super-8 camera. It is reported that there are also random single frames of film which show these lights giving off incredible <<<flash streaks of energy>>> which is the focus of the story.

Well...yours truly, Capt. Video (OK...film, video, whatever) is here to answer this so-called mystery. Since there is no 'contest' or award for the correct answer...I guess I am free to post my theory here for public consumption. In fact...I am somewhat amazed this possibility hasn't been addressed (at least not in the report) by their local investigators and experts. I agree with them that the film was NOT a deliberate hoax by the photographer. I believe she is just as ignorant of the cause...which I state here and now as a simple MECHANICAL FAILURE of her filming apparatus!
Read on...

Addressing this to those that sat through the show...recall as they played back the footage to show the individual frames which contained the -streaks of light energy-. Notice how you can see the nighttime sky or horizon with a few non-descript white lights through most of the film. All of a sudden, there appears a *SINGLE FRAME* of the super-8 film which contains the ballyhooed light show. Immediately following the frame, the normal nighttime footage returns and a few seconds later...another streak-frame appears...totally different in composition. The photographer would claim that she could not SEE

any such light display. It could ONLY be captured with HER camera. At the rate of speed in which a single frame of super-8 film is exposed through a camera...I would understand her statement!

Red Flag time, everyone.

What I propose is this: The woman's particular super-8 camera is faulty. In simple terms, the motorized components stop operating at certain intervals. She may *hear and feel* the motor turning, but in effect the film has stopped moving through the guides, sprockets and plates. In addition, the camera's shutter gate is stuck OPEN and light is continuously pouring onto the poor frame of exposed film which happens to be positioned in the exposure window. The construction of the camera prevents light from reaching the other frames before and after the affected frame in question. Soon after, the camera's mechanics corrects itself and once again it is taking normal film imagery. As the photographer continues to expose more footage through the lens, the problem reoccurs a few seconds later due to the same mechanical defect and the anomaly is repeated with different visual results.

So what is this brilliant streaking of light attributed to? Good question, but unfortunately an easily explainable answer. In fact, anyone can reproduce the same effect with a simple SLR 35mm or better camera! Just load up your film and head for your neighborhood street lights at night. Set your exposure to the BULB or TIME setting. Camera too new? Then you will have to play with the longest (slowest) exposure setting your camera offers. Only have a point-and-hoot model? Too bad. What are you doing in the research business with such inadequate gear in the first place?? :-)

Anyway...the trick is to make a time-laps exposure of distant city lights WITHOUT a tri-pod. Hey...*she* doesn't use a tri-pod when filming and this is the PRECISE reason she has those brilliant randomly streaking frames. Leave the shutter in the OPEN position for a few seconds and *slowly* move the camera around. Then close the shutter. Try different settings. By holding the camera unsteadily in your hand and making jagged motions, you are in essence becoming a graphic painter of light upon your film. This is what I believe is actually being placed on her random individual frames of super-8 footage.

To further my explanation with one more point...recall that our good friend Robert Stack reports that the show's own photographer tried to film the phenomenon side by side with the woman. She, of course using her own super-8 camera and he using one of his own. They even *switched* cameras which each other to see if there would be any difference. Naturally, there was none. Her camera produced the usual single-frame light streaks...his did not. Now, expecting that both cameras running the same format at the same rate of speed, and taking the exact same footage of whatever lights she wanted to focus on... why would HER camera be the only one 'blessed' with results? The normal footage of nighttime lights was similar between the two!

From this message, you can see that I am in no way impressed by any 'unexplained' claim of authenticity which is attached to this particular segment of the TV show. Of course, the show admittedly reveals all its footage to be dramatic re-enactments and no deception is implied. But they did show the *actual* footage claimed to be shoot by this woman...and hence the footage became open to debate and scrutiny. Consider this particular story superficially debunked by my hypothesis and/or open for debate if one

cares to. I remain, C.V.

--

Steve Rose - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f2.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)

Subject: Re: Al seckel

Date: 14 Dec 90 06:51:03 GMT

> And I knew Gauquelin was not a skeptic, I was referring to the
> "Gauquelin incident," which was, I think, a bit more significant than
> you imply. It is my understanding that the Mars Effect has never been
> successfully debunked (much to MY chagrin as much as anyone else's).
> Am I wrong in that understanding?

No. That's right. The problem was that Michel Gauquelin's legal threats just made everyone drop the matter entirely. My impression is (speaking as a newcomer and outsider, with just a math B.A.) that the existing tests may have been statistically inadequate, or at least questionable. There things will likely remain, which is a pity.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f2.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: conncoll.bitnet!gateh@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM

Subject: Re: Prof. Jean-Pierre Petit

Date: 15 Dec 90 00:20:27 GMT

From: gateh@conncoll.bitnet

Jim Speiser writes:

+ For another, he seemed to talk in absolutes a great deal more than I am
+ comfortable hearing from a scientist. I will be interested in hearing
+ others' comments on this file.

I too felt more and more queasy as I read the interview. I thought the

initial parts were interesting and relatively level-headed, however what started as (to paraphrase), 'there is strong evidence that the Belgium sightings are not hoaxes, and further more that evidence would indicate that the craft might not be of terrestrial origin', turned into 'the extraterrestrials are using [some off-the-top-of-my-head theory about] folds in the fabric of space dividing the two[!] universes to travel to earth, which may or may not be an interstellar crossroads'. Yeek-a-mouse! This is hardly a scientific approach, and regardless of whether or not the theorizing holds any merit, it is entirely improper to be babbling openly about it in the interview. I can't see him amassing much support for UFO research from the scientific community with talk like this.

He may be a respected scientist, but then again so were Pons and Fleischmann (sp?). He certainly hasn't garnered much respect from this reader.

Cheers! - Gregg

Gregg TeHennepe	SysAdm, Academic Computing	Yes, but this
gateh@conncoll.bitnet	Connecticut College, New London, CT	one goes to 11...

From: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Clark Matthews)
Subject: Re: Phenomenon Framed Again!
Date: 15 Dec 90 00:49:00 GMT

Interesting post, Steve. Please consider a partial rebuttal from a former filmmaker.

> the film was NOT a deliberate hoax by the
> photographer. I believe she is just as ignorant of the
> cause...which I state here and now as a simple MECHANICAL
> FAILURE of her filming apparatus!

> All of a sudden, there appears a *SINGLE FRAME* of the
> super-8 film which contains the ballyhooed light show.

Okay, I don't think the film was a deliberate hoax, either. But a simple mechanical failure? Rather unlikely. Flash frames or static discharges within a camera are not confined to single frames of film. The lady's images are confined to single frames of film. Plus...

> What I propose is this: The woman's particular super-8
> camera is faulty. In simple terms, the motorized components
> stop operating at certain intervals.

... except she has obtained similar photographs with three different cameras.

> In fact, anyone can reproduced the same effect
> with a simple SLR 35mm or better camera! Just load up your

You bet! Unfortunately, motion picture equipment rarely includes a lockable shutter. Practically NO Super-8mm cameras do or did, the only exception I am aware of is the old Bolex Super-8. Time-lapse or intervalometer equipment can be added on to these cameras, but if that were the case (she was using an intervalometer, say) then the HAND-HELD portions of the film would have been impossible to film side-by-side with the gag shots.

Film equipment pretty much forces you to use a FIXED shutter speed, Steve. Usually 1/48th of a second. Sometimes less, if you are using a nice 16mm camera with a variable shutter, like an Eclair, Arri, Panaflex, etc. It's simple -- for a movie to be a movie, it must have been photographed at a fixed shutter speed. The only exception is the computer-controlled shutter equipment of special effects cameras, like George Lucas uses at Industrial Light and Magic.

What's really interesting is if you consider the possibility that the lights/objects were performing complex maneuvers, in formation, and then returning to their original positions -- in 1/24th of a SECOND! [1/48th open shutter + 1/48th closed shutter = 1/24th second total shutter interval.]

I suspect that you will feel this is a ridiculous and impossible proposition, but an Australian TV news crew shot about 60 seconds of footage of a UFO from a helicopter that showed just such incredible maneuvers. The footage looks just like the Vancouver lady's, and points to maneuverability and speed that is unheard-of, even in conventional UFO documentation [e.g., radar tracks at 5,800 mph, right-angle turns, etc.]

Equally interesting, the lady's footage shows interesting color shifts that could correspond to time-shifted light radiation (i.e., a time-bending mechanism at work, slowing down the local flow of time & allowing outlandish maneuvers in 1/24th second) and regular blips of light along the "streaks" (sort of like a time-lapsed ANO light on a airplane).

> Consider this particular story
> superficially debunked by my hypothesis and/or open for
> debate if one cares to. I remain, C.V.

Debunked? Not yet. Let's keep the key word "superficially". :-)

Best,
Clark

--

Clark Matthews - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Clark.Matthews@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Phenomenon framed again!
Date: 14 Dec 90 20:48:00 GMT

Steve:

I agree with your assessment. The single-frame light show struck me as well.
Have you tried calling the UM 800 number?

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Delton@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Delton)
Subject: Re: Phenomenon framed again!
Date: 16 Dec 90 00:50:00 GMT

The "light streaks and overexposure" on single frames used to be common knowledge back when 8mm amateur film was in it's heyday. I used to get them all the time from not releasing the "button" quickly. It would allow the shutter to stop in the open position and wipe out that frame.

I didn't see that particular Unsolved Mystery but from the way you described it it doesn't sound like much of a mystery to me either. I guess all the segments can't be winners.

--
Jim Delton - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Delton@f37.n114.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Phenomenon framed again!
Date: 14 Dec 90 16:34:01 GMT

> Did we all get to take a break from reality Wednesday night, and
> capture the outrageous segment of NBC's "Unsolved Mysteries" on
> our VCRs?

I think you've completely nailed that one.

I also wondered if that Super 8 camera has a single-frame mode we didn't know about, but I think you're most likely right about the mechanical problem. I suspect the film simply jumps the sprockets every now and then.

An obvious test would be to have a second photographer there with a *film* camera. I understood that the UM crew had a video camera, and it's possible that if all that light activity took place in 1/30 second or less it could occur between video frames and not be seen by the video camera. That's stretching it, of course.

A high-speed film camera would be even better.

Wanna have some fun? Hold your camera's shutter open for a few seconds while you drive along a city main street. Talk about lights and streaks!

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Steve Rose)

Subject: Re: Phenomenon framed again!

Date: 15 Dec 90 17:30:08 GMT

>> capture the outrageous segment of NBC's "Unsolved Mysteries"

>

> I think you've completely nailed that one.

> I also wondered if that Super 8 camera has a single-frame

> mode we didn't know about, but I think you're most likely

> right about the mechanical problem.

While that was suggested here locally...it is pointed out that a single-frame mode would NOT leave the shutter open long enough to capture the streaky movement by her hands. The affected frame(s) would be no more or less exposed than the rest of the footage...hence I believe not to be the cause.

> An obvious test would be to have a second photographer

> there with a *film* camera. I understood that the UM crew had a video

Perhaps, But I believe I heard Mr. Stack state that they used a camera of 'similar design'. If so...I suspect that he meant it was a film super-8. In addition, remember that the raw segments of the show are shot on *film*...albeit not 8 millimeter format. It could be possible that he used his stock camera. We may never know.

> That's stretching it, of course.

> A high-speed film camera would be even better.

Somehow, I suspect the producers and technicians knew they had a dud there, even if the show must go on...so why waste the test footage? :-)

> Wanna have some fun? Hold your camera's shutter open for a
> few seconds while you drive along a city main street. Talk
> about lights and streaks!

Here's another exercise...if you can leave the shutter open on your still camera...aim it at a lamppost at night and try to write your name by making 'script' movements of the letters holding the camera in the air. Fun.

Thank you and now...back to our show. :-)

--

Steve Rose - via FidoNet node 1:310/8

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Steve Rose)

Subject: Re: Phenomenon framed again!

Date: 15 Dec 90 17:58:46 GMT

> She did say she used three cameras? I must have missed
> that; I'll have to look at the tape.

Ahhh, but gentlemen...in dealing in this arena as you know...one must separate the feces from the bullfeces.

Realize that she only provided footage for examination from ONE film roll. It is assumed that all the blown-up shots were taken from that roll. The additional roll she shot while the crew was there also showed phenomenon captured (according to Stack)...but with the SAME camera! At no time did she produce any second or third camera for examination. For that matter, she hasn't allowed the afflicted camera to be taken for tests, either!

Also remember...she was shooting mysterious *lights* from her balcony and was not expecting any flashing phenomena. She may have owned other cameras (amazing how they were ALL super-8, eh?) but she was not shooting to get these flashes...only to capture some 'strange lights' which is a separate issue. It was only AFTER the roll was developed that the frames and light "flashes" were discovered. Please keep this in mind...she was NOT shooting to get the fireworks originally...only some simple 'lights' she saw.

I suspect that she did NOT get any valid flashing display with her first two units beyond the lights themselves. I believe when she started using the third and current camera and the flashing frames were found (hopefully not deliberately faked) she took it to mean a definite positive sign that she was capturing unique communications of some sort and that her camera was privied

to them.

True, such mechanical defects are not common...but in my field of work with video related matters, we all know to look at the gear first, when a problem in operations occur that is not attributed to user error. Just by looking at the presented frames in question...I can plainly see an answer that is not attributable to 'communicating lights'. The show's producer wisely alerted the viewers that they themselves could NOT duplicate the results with their own gear. I believe them and am grateful for their candor.

--

Steve Rose - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Steve.Rose@f134.n109.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Roswell Witness Surfaces
Date: 17 Dec 90 09:11:00 GMT

Here is an article that was contributed by Sandy Barbre regarding an article which appeared in a Springfield, MO newspaper on December 9, 1990.

=====
CONTRIBUTED BY: Sandy Barbre
December 17, 1990
=====

The following was taken from a newspaper from Springfield, Missouri, dated Sunday, December 9th, 1990. The name of the newspaper I think, is the NEWS-LEADER and article is in the section called Ozarks Accent.

-+-----

TITLED: NOTED EXPERT FINDS ACCOUNT CONVINCING.
BY: Mike O'Brien

What sets Gerald Anderson apart from the thousands of other American's, including scores of Ozarkers, who say they've seen UFO's or even insist they've been kidnapped by creatures from outer space?

Why are Gerald Anderson's childhood recollections stirring international interest among UFO researchers whose reputations have been built on healthy skepticism and willingness to debunk hoaxes?

Because of little things he has to say and how he says them.

Stanton Friedman, a nuclear physicist who has lectured on more than 600 college campuses about UFOs, describes Anderson as "a

really significant, potentially the most important" witness to what both men believe was the aftermath of one of two space craft crashes in New Mexico in mid-summer 1947.

Friedman is co-authoring a book based upon several years of painstaking investigation into the haunting mystery. He was startled, upon meeting Anderson for the first time only a few months ago, to hear the Springfieldian echo details of the yet to be published research.

"There's no way he could know some of these things unless he had been there at the time," Friedman believes.

Example: only days before first talking with Anderson, Friedman coaxed a heretofore reluctant New Mexico mortician into recounting a run-in he'd had in 1947 with an especially unpleasant red-headed captain who was heading up a team recovering bodies from a hush-hush aircraft crash. Anderson, too, spoke of a red-headed captain with a mean disposition. Friedman says the descriptions of the ornery officer provided by the two match precisely, although Anderson and the mortician never have met.

In sketches of the desert crash scene drawn by Anderson in Springfield following a hypnosis, a lonely windmill appears in the distance. When Friedman later arranged for Anderson to return to New Mexico to pinpoint the long-ago crash site, no such windmill could be seen on the horizon-- until, almost by accident, the windmill was spotted behind trees that had grown up during the 43 years since Anderson was last there.

"I got shivers over that one," says John Carpenter, who has extensively debriefed Anderson over the past 4 months and went along on Anderson's return trip to New Mexico in October.

Carpenter holds degrees in psychology and psychiatric social work from DePauw and Washington universities and trained in clinical hypnosis at the Menninger Institute. He's in his 12th year of work at a psychiatric hospital facility in Springfield.

"When Gerald tells his story, it's not just a story -- it's his life he's telling you, intermixed with his feelings and his beliefs and all that is Gerald," Carpenter says.

"When someone is spinning a hoax or tale, they only give you enough to raise your curiosity. Not Gerald. He gives you everything, in detail, much more than you ask him for. He'd be setting himself up to be found out if it wasn't true. He's so confident, he goes so much further than a hoaxer would ever dare."

Carpenter puts great stock in Anderson's recountings under hypnosis. "It's what he didn't say that was significant."

Carpenter says, explaining that despite clever prodding, Anderson never committed a hoaxer's mistake of "recalling" something that shouldn't be a part of his own memory.

"And when he's under hypnosis, all the bigger, adult words drop out when he describes events from his childhood," Carpenter found. "He relates what he was in child-like terms."

Carpenter also detected "genuine amazement" when Anderson heard what had been dredged from his subconscious memory under hypnosis. "The look on his face was priceless when he realized he'd produced details he'd forgotten on a conscious level so long ago."

Most subtle but perhaps most telling, in Carpenter's view, was Anderson's reaction to being accepted as a viable witness to an extraordinary encounter with a spacecraft and creatures from beyond Earth.

"He was so grateful at being taken seriously. You could see the relief and release after all those years, and the great hope that other people would take him seriously too, once and for all."

[Continued next message...]

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:310/8
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: mcorbin@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

*****To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to*****
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

*****The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter*****